

A note on trace fields of complex hyperbolic groups

Heleno Cunha Nikolay Gusevskii*
cunha@mat.ufmg.br nikolay@mat.ufmg.br

Departamento de Matemática
Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais
Belo Horizonte – MG
Brazil
30123-970

Abstract

We show that if Γ is an irreducible subgroup of $SU(2, 1)$, then Γ contains a loxodromic element A . If A has eigenvalues $\lambda_1 = \lambda e^{i\varphi}$, $\lambda_2 = e^{-2i\varphi}$, $\lambda_3 = \lambda^{-1}e^{i\varphi}$, we prove that Γ is conjugate in $SU(2, 1)$ to a subgroup of $SU(2, 1, \mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda))$, where $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$ is the field generated by the trace field $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma)$ of Γ and λ . It follows from this that if Γ is an irreducible subgroup of $SU(2, 1)$ such that the trace field $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma)$ is real, then Γ is conjugate in $SU(2, 1)$ to a subgroup of $SO(2, 1)$. As a geometric application of the above, we get that if G is an irreducible discrete subgroup of $PU(2, 1)$, then G is an $\mathbb{R}$ -Fuchsian subgroup of $PU(2, 1)$ if and only if the invariant trace field $k(G)$ of G is real.

MSC: 32H20; 20H10; 22E40; 57S30; 32G07; 32C16

Keywords: Complex hyperbolic groups, trace fields.

Introduction

Arithmetic methods are a powerful tool in the study of Kleinian groups, discrete subgroups of $PSL(2, \mathbb{C})$, especially of finite-covolume discrete groups, as was demonstrated in [21], see also an extensive bibliography there. A central theme in this theory is to understand the structure of the invariant trace field and the invariant (quaternion) algebra associated to a Kleinian group. In the case of complex hyperbolic geometry, that is, in the case of subgroups of $PU(n, 1)$ ($SU(n, 1)$) little known about these objects, see for instance [23], where the study of the invariant trace fields and the invariant algebras associated to subgroups of $SU(n, 1)$ was initiated. In particular, in this work the invariant trace field and the invariant algebra were introduced for subgroups of $SU(n, 1)$. An important problem here is to understand whether a subgroup of $SU(n, 1)$ can be realized over the field

*Corresponding author. Supported by CNPq and FAPEMIG.

generated by the eigenvalues of its elements. In this paper, we prove that any irreducible subgroup Γ of $SU(2, 1)$ contains a loxodromic element A and it can be realized over the field generated by the trace field of Γ and the eigenvalues of A .

The main result of our paper is the following theorem:

Theorem A *Let Γ be an irreducible subgroup of $SU(2, 1)$ and $A \in \Gamma$ be loxodromic with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 = \lambda e^{i\varphi}$, $\lambda_2 = e^{-2i\varphi}$, $\lambda_3 = \lambda^{-1} e^{i\varphi}$. Then Γ is conjugate in $SU(2, 1)$ to a subgroup of $SU(2, 1, \mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda))$, where $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$ is the field generated by the trace field $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma)$ of Γ and λ .*

As a corollary of this theorem, we get the following

Theorem B *Let Γ be an irreducible subgroup of $SU(2, 1)$ such that $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma)$ is a subset of $\mathbb{R}$, then Γ is conjugate in $SU(2, 1)$ to a subgroup of $SO(2, 1)$.*

We would like to stress that in Theorem A and Theorem B we do not assume that the group Γ is discrete.

Also, in this paper, we define an invariant trace field for subgroups of $PU(2, 1)$. Let G be a subgroup of $PU(2, 1)$ and $\Gamma = \pi^{-1}(G)$, where $\pi : SU(2, 1) \rightarrow PU(2, 1)$ is a natural projection. Then the *invariant trace field* of G , denoted by $k(G)$, is defined to be the field $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma^3)$, where $\Gamma^3 = \langle \gamma^3 : \gamma \in \Gamma \rangle$. It follows from [23] that the invariant trace field is an invariant of the commensurability class.

We say that a subgroup G of $PU(2, 1)$ is an $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroup if it leaves invariant a totally real geodesic 2-plane in $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$. A subgroup G of $PU(2, 1)$ is called $\mathbb{R}$ -Fuchsian if it is a discrete $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroup. A subgroup G is a $\mathbb{C}$ -subgroup if it leaves invariant a complex geodesic in $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$. A subgroup G of $PU(2, 1)$ is called $\mathbb{C}$ -Fuchsian if it is a discrete $\mathbb{C}$ -subgroup.

By applying Theorem B, we get the following characterization of discrete non-elementary $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroups of $PU(2, 1)$.

Theorem C *Let G be an irreducible discrete subgroup of $PU(2, 1)$. Then G is an $\mathbb{R}$ -Fuchsian if and only if the invariant trace field $k(G)$ of G is real.*

This implies, in particular, that if G is an irreducible discrete subgroup of $PU(2, 1)$ whose invariant trace field is real, then the invariant algebra associated to G is of dimension nine over $k(G)$. On the other hand, if G is a non-elementary $\mathbb{C}$ -subgroup of $PU(2, 1)$ (G is reducible in this case) with real invariant trace field, then the invariant algebra associated to G is of dimension four.

As a corollary of Theorem C, we have the following.

Theorem D *Let G be a discrete non-elementary subgroup of $PU(2, 1)$ such that the invariant trace field $k(G)$ of G is real. Then G is either $\mathbb{R}$ -Fuchsian or $\mathbb{C}$ -Fuchsian.*

We remark that Theorem D can be considered as a complex hyperbolic analog of a classical result due to B.Maskit, see Theorem G.18 in [22] and Corollary 3.2.5 in [21]. Finally, we would like to mention that some related questions were considered in [3, 14, 15, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30].

The article is organized as follows. In Section 1, we review some basic facts in complex hyperbolic geometry. In Section 2, we prove our main results.

1 Complex hyperbolic plane and its isometry group

Let V be a 3-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$ -vector space equipped with a Hermitian form $\langle -, - \rangle$ of signature $(2, 1)$. We denote by $\mathbb{P}(V)$ the complex projectivization of V and by $\mathbb{P} : V \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(V)$ a natural projection.

Let V_-, V_0, V_+ be the subsets of $V \setminus \{0\}$ consisting of vectors where $\langle v, v \rangle$ is negative, zero, or positive respectively. Vectors in V_0 are called *null* or *isotropic*, vectors in V_- are called *negative*, and vectors in V_+ are called *positive*. Their projections to $\mathbb{P}(V)$ are called *isotropic*, *negative*, and *positive* points respectively.

The projective model of the *complex hyperbolic plane* $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ is the set of negative points in $\mathbb{P}(V)$, that is, $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2 = \mathbb{P}(V_-)$. The boundary $\partial\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2 = \mathbb{P}(V_0)$ of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ is the 3-sphere formed by all isotropic points.

The Hermitian form $\langle -, - \rangle$ defines a metric, the Bergman metric, on $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$, see [16]. Let $U(V)$ be the unitary group corresponding to this Hermitian form. Then the holomorphic isometry group of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ is the projective unitary group $PU(V)$, and the full isometry group of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ is generated by $PU(V)$ and complex conjugation. We denote by $SU(V)$ the subgroup of linear transformations in $U(V)$ with determinant 1.

For our purposes it is convenient to work with a basis $e = \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ in V which has the following properties:

$$\langle e_1, e_1 \rangle = 0, \langle e_2, e_2 \rangle = 1, \langle e_3, e_3 \rangle = 0, \langle e_1, e_2 \rangle = 0, \langle e_2, e_3 \rangle = 0, \langle e_1, e_3 \rangle = 1.$$

So, in this basis e_1 and e_3 are isotropic and e_2 is positive. In what follows, we denote by $\mathbb{C}^{2,1}$ the vector space V equipped with this basis. If the vectors $z = (z_1, z_2, z_3)^T$ and $w = (w_1, w_2, w_3)^T$ in $\mathbb{C}^{2,1}$ are given by their coordinates in $e = \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$, then the Hermitian product $\langle v, w \rangle$ is given by

$$\langle v, w \rangle = z_1 \bar{w}_3 + z_2 \bar{w}_2 + z_3 \bar{w}_1.$$

The use of this basis simplifies essentially matrix computations and it was successfully applied in a series of works, see, for instance [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 29]. Throughout this paper we will use this basis.

Let $U(2, 1)$ and $SU(2, 1)$ denote the representations of $U(V)$ and $SU(V)$ in the basis $e = \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$.

If A is an element of $SU(2, 1)$, then the matrix A is defined by the following simple conditions:

$$\langle v_1, v_1 \rangle = 0, \langle v_2, v_2 \rangle = 1, \langle v_3, v_3 \rangle = 0, \langle v_1, v_2 \rangle = 0, \langle v_2, v_3 \rangle = 0, \langle v_1, v_3 \rangle = 1,$$

where v_1, v_2, v_3 denote the vectors defined by the rows of A .

Also, we have the following useful formula for the inverse of $A \in \mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} \end{bmatrix}, \quad A^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{a}_{33} & \bar{a}_{23} & \bar{a}_{13} \\ \bar{a}_{32} & \bar{a}_{22} & \bar{a}_{12} \\ \bar{a}_{31} & \bar{a}_{21} & \bar{a}_{11} \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is seen that A^{-1} is the Hermitian anti-transpose of A .

The non-trivial elements of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ fall into three general conjugacy types, depending on the number and location of their fixed points.

- *Elliptic elements* have a fixed point in $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$,
- *Parabolic elements* have a single fixed point on the boundary of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$,
- *Loxodromic elements* have exactly two fixed points on the boundary of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$.

This exhausts all possibilities, see [16] for details.

Let $\pi : \mathrm{SU}(2, 1) \rightarrow \mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ be a natural projection. We call an element $A \in \mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ loxodromic (parabolic, elliptic) if its projectivization $\pi(A)$ is loxodromic (parabolic, elliptic). For instance, any loxodromic element $A \in \mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ is conjugate in $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ to an element of the following form

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\lambda_1 = \lambda e^{i\varphi}$, $\lambda_2 = e^{-2i\varphi}$, $\lambda_3 = \lambda^{-1} e^{i\varphi}$, $\lambda > 0$, $\lambda \neq 1$, $\varphi \in (-\pi, \pi]$.

A parabolic element $g \in \mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ is *unipotent* if it can be represented by a unipotent element of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$, that is, a matrix having 1 as its only eigenvalue. Otherwise, g is *ellipto-parabolic*. In that case g can be represented by an element of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ having a repeated non-real eigenvalue of norm 1. Also, g has a unique invariant complex geodesic, see below.

There are two types of totally geodesic submanifolds of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ of real dimension two:

- *Complex geodesics* (copies of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^1$) have constant sectional curvature -1 .
- *Totally real geodesic 2-planes* (copies of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{R}}^2$) have constant sectional curvature $-1/4$.

Any complex geodesic is the intersection of a complex projective line in $\mathbb{P}(V)$ with $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$, and it is uniquely defined by its polar point, which is positive [16]. We recall that a polar point to a complex projective line c in $\mathbb{P}(V)$ is the projectivization of the Hermitian orthogonal complement in V of $\mathbb{P}^{-1}(c)$.

Any totally real geodesic 2-plane is the intersection of a totally real projective plane in $\mathbb{P}(V)$ with $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$.

We recall that a subspace S of $V_{\mathbb{R}}$, where $V_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the real vector space underlying V , is *totally real* if and only if S and its image $\mathbb{J}(S)$ are orthogonal with respect to the Hermitian product $\langle -, - \rangle$, see [16]. It is easy to show that S is totally real if and only if the Hermitian product $\langle v, u \rangle$ is real for all $v, u \in S$. An example of a totally real subspace is the $\mathbb{R}$ -linear span of $e = \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$, the basis considered above. We call this subspace a *canonical* totally real subspace. The projectivization of this space is called a *canonical totally real* projective 2-plane. Any totally real 2-plane in $\mathbb{P}(V)$ is the image of the canonical totally real projective 2-plane under an element from the group $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$. The stabilizer of the canonical totally real subspace in $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ can be canonically identified with the group $\mathrm{SO}(2, 1)$.

A chain is the boundary of a complex geodesic. An $\mathbb{R}$ -circle is the boundary of a totally real geodesic 2-plane, see [16].

Let G be a subgroup of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$. We say that G is a $\mathbb{C}$ -subgroup if it leaves invariant a complex geodesic. G is called an $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroup if it leaves invariant a totally real geodesic 2-plane. A subgroup Γ of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ is called $\mathbb{C}$ -subgroup if its projectivization is a $\mathbb{C}$ -subgroup of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$. Similarly, a subgroup Γ of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ is called an $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroup if its projectivization is an $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroup of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$. We say that a subgroup G of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ is $\mathbb{C}$ -Fuchsian if it is a discrete $\mathbb{C}$ -subgroup, and G is called $\mathbb{R}$ -Fuchsian if it is a discrete $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroup. Typical examples of $\mathbb{C}$ -subgroups of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ are subgroups of $\mathrm{SU}(1, 1)$ canonically embedded into $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$, and typical examples of $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroups of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ are subgroups of $\mathrm{SO}(2, 1)$ canonically embedded into $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$.

Recall that a subgroup Γ of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ is called *reducible* if it has an invariant proper $\mathbb{C}$ -subspace of V , and called *irreducible* otherwise. It is clear that a subgroup Γ of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ is irreducible if and only if Γ has no invariant 1-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$ -subspaces of V .

A subgroup G of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ is called *reducible* if all elements of G have a common fixed point in their action on the projective space $\mathbb{P}(V)$. Otherwise, G is called *irreducible*.

A subgroup G of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ is called *elementary* if it has a finite orbit in its action on $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \cup \partial \mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$. Otherwise, G is *non-elementary*. A subgroup Γ of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ is called *elementary* if its projectivization is elementary. Otherwise, Γ is *non-elementary*.

Clearly, any $\mathbb{C}$ -subgroup G of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ is reducible because the polar point to the invariant complex geodesic of G is a common fixed point for all elements of G in their action on $\mathbb{P}(V)$. Also, it is clear that a non-elementary $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroup of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ is irreducible.

2 Trace fields of complex hyperbolic groups

Let Γ be a subgroup of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$. Then the *trace field* of Γ , denoted by $\mathbb{Q}(\mathrm{tr}\Gamma)$, is the field generated by the traces of all the elements of Γ over the base field $\mathbb{Q}$ of rational numbers. For simplicity, we will denote the trace field of Γ by $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma)$. Of course, $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma)$ is a conjugacy invariant. We remark that the trace field

$\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma)$ is also invariant under complex conjugation, since for $B \in \mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ we have $\mathrm{tr}(B^{-1}) = \overline{\mathrm{tr}(B)}$.

If Γ contains a loxodromic element A with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 = \lambda e^{i\varphi}$, $\lambda_2 = e^{-i2\varphi}$, $\lambda_3 = \lambda^{-1} e^{i\varphi}$, then $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$ denotes the field generated by $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma)$ and λ . Also, for any field k we denote by $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1, k)$ the intersection of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ with $\mathrm{M}(3, k)$.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $\Gamma = \langle A \rangle$ be the group generated by a loxodromic element $A \in \mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 = \lambda e^{i\varphi}$, $\lambda_2 = e^{-i2\varphi}$, $\lambda_3 = \lambda^{-1} e^{i\varphi}$. Then $e^{i\varphi} \in \mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$.*

PROOF: Since $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma)$ is invariant under complex conjugation, it follows that $\mathrm{Re}(\mathrm{tr}(A))$ and $|\mathrm{tr}(A)|^2$ are in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma)$. We have that

$$\mathrm{tr}(A) = \lambda e^{i\varphi} + \lambda^{-1} e^{i\varphi} + e^{-i2\varphi}$$

and

$$\mathrm{tr}(A^{-1}) = \overline{\mathrm{tr}(A)} = \lambda e^{-i\varphi} + \lambda^{-1} e^{-i\varphi} + e^{i2\varphi}.$$

A direct computation shows that

$$\mathrm{Re}(\mathrm{tr}(A)) = \cos 2\varphi + (\lambda + \lambda^{-1}) \cos \varphi = 2 \cos^2 \varphi + (\lambda + \lambda^{-1}) \cos \varphi - 1$$

and

$$|\mathrm{tr}(A)|^2 = (\lambda^2 + \lambda^{-2}) + 2(\lambda + \lambda^{-1}) \cos 3\varphi + 3.$$

Since $\lambda + \lambda^{-1} \neq 0$, the last formula implies that $\cos 3\varphi \in \mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$.

Looking at these formulae, one could expect that $\cos \varphi$ is in a proper extension of $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$, but the following trick shows that, in fact, $\cos \varphi$ is in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$.

It is easy to see that the following formula

$$(4 \cos^2 \varphi + 2t \cos \varphi + t^2 - 3) \cos \varphi = 4 \cos^3 \varphi - 3 \cos \varphi + (2 \cos^2 \varphi + t \cos \varphi)t$$

is true for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and for all $\varphi \in (-\pi, \pi]$.

Also, it is elementary to check that

$$4 \cos^2 \varphi + 2t \cos \varphi + t^2 - 3 \neq 0$$

for all $t > 2$ and for all $\varphi \in (-\pi, \pi]$. This implies that for all $t > 2$ and for all $\varphi \in (-\pi, \pi]$ we have that

$$\cos \varphi = \frac{4 \cos^3 \varphi - 3 \cos \varphi + (2 \cos^2 \varphi + t \cos \varphi)t}{4 \cos^2 \varphi + 2t \cos \varphi + t^2 - 3}.$$

In particular, taking $t = \lambda + \lambda^{-1}$ and using the identity $\cos 3\varphi = 4 \cos^3 \varphi - 3 \cos \varphi$, we get the formula

$$\cos \varphi = \frac{\cos 3\varphi + (2 \cos^2 \varphi + (\lambda + \lambda^{-1}) \cos \varphi)(\lambda + \lambda^{-1})}{4 \cos^2 \varphi + 2(\lambda + \lambda^{-1}) \cos \varphi + (\lambda + \lambda^{-1})^2 - 3}.$$

One verifies that this can be re-written as

$$\cos \varphi = \frac{\cos 3\varphi + (\operatorname{Re}(\operatorname{tr}(A)) + 1)(\lambda + \lambda^{-1})}{2\operatorname{Re}(\operatorname{tr}(A)) + (\lambda + \lambda^{-1})^2 - 1}.$$

Therefore, the above implies that $\cos \varphi \in \mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$ for all $\varphi \in (-\pi, \pi]$.

Next, a direct computation shows that

$$i \sin \varphi = \frac{\operatorname{tr}(A) - \overline{\operatorname{tr}(A)}}{2(\lambda + \lambda^{-1} + 2 \cos \varphi)}.$$

All the above implies that $e^{i\varphi} \in \mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$ for all $\varphi \in (-\pi, \pi]$. ■

Corollary 2.1 *Let $\Gamma = \langle A \rangle$ be the group generated by a loxodromic element $A \in \operatorname{SU}(2, 1)$ with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 = \lambda e^{i\varphi}$, $\lambda_2 = e^{-i2\varphi}$, $\lambda_3 = \lambda^{-1} e^{i\varphi}$. Then all these eigenvalues belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$.*

Lemma 2.2 *Let Γ be a subgroup of $\operatorname{SU}(2, 1)$ containing a loxodromic element $A = \operatorname{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$, where $\lambda_1 = \lambda e^{i\varphi}$, $\lambda_2 = e^{-i2\varphi}$, $\lambda_3 = \lambda^{-1} e^{i\varphi}$. Then for any element $B = (b_{ij}) \in \Gamma$, the diagonal elements of B are in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$.*

PROOF: We write

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\lambda}_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{\lambda}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \bar{\lambda}_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} & b_{13} \\ b_{21} & b_{22} & b_{23} \\ b_{31} & b_{32} & b_{33} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then computations show that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{tr}(B) &= b_{11} + b_{22} + b_{33} = t_1, \\ \operatorname{tr}(AB) &= \lambda_1 b_{11} + \lambda_2 b_{22} + \lambda_3 b_{33} = t_2, \\ \operatorname{tr}(A^{-1}B) &= \bar{\lambda}_3 b_{11} + \bar{\lambda}_2 b_{22} + \bar{\lambda}_1 b_{33} = t_3. \end{aligned}$$

Note that every t_i lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma)$. We consider these equalities as a system of linear equations in three unknowns b_{11}, b_{22}, b_{33} . Let us show that the matrix L of this system is nonsingular. We write

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \lambda_3 \\ \bar{\lambda}_3 & \bar{\lambda}_2 & \bar{\lambda}_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then a computation gives that

$$\det L = (\lambda_2 \bar{\lambda}_1 - \lambda_3 \bar{\lambda}_2) - (\lambda_1 \bar{\lambda}_1 - \lambda_3 \bar{\lambda}_3) + (\lambda_1 \bar{\lambda}_2 - \lambda_2 \bar{\lambda}_3) = (\lambda^{-2} - \lambda^2) + 2(\lambda - \lambda^{-1}) \cos 3\varphi.$$

The equality $\det L = 0$ is equivalent to $\cos 3\varphi = (\lambda + \lambda^{-1})/2$, which is impossible since $\lambda + \lambda^{-1} > 2$.

It follows from Corollary 2.1 that every coefficient of the system lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. Solving this system by Cramer's rule, we conclude that every b_{ii} lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. ■

Lemma 2.3 *Let Γ be a subgroup of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ containing a loxodromic element $A = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$, where $\lambda_1 = \lambda e^{i\varphi}$, $\lambda_2 = e^{-i2\varphi}$, $\lambda_3 = \lambda^{-1} e^{i\varphi}$. Then for any element $B = (b_{ij}) \in \Gamma$, the products $b_{12}b_{21}$, $b_{13}b_{31}$, $b_{23}b_{32}$ are in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$.*

PROOF: Let $C = BAB$. First, we compute the diagonal elements c_{ii} of the matrix C . They are

$$\begin{aligned} c_{11} &= \lambda_1 b_{11}^2 + \lambda_2 b_{12}b_{21} + \lambda_3 b_{13}b_{31}, \\ c_{22} &= \lambda_1 b_{12}b_{21} + \lambda_2 b_{22}^2 + \lambda_3 b_{23}b_{32}, \\ c_{33} &= \lambda_1 b_{13}b_{31} + \lambda_2 b_{23}b_{32} + \lambda_3 b_{33}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then by applying Lemma 2.2, we have that c_{ii} is in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. Also, by the same reason, b_{ii} is in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. Therefore, we can re-write these equalities in the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_2 b_{12}b_{21} + \lambda_3 b_{13}b_{31} &= t_1, \\ \lambda_1 b_{12}b_{21} + \lambda_3 b_{23}b_{32} &= t_2, \\ \lambda_1 b_{13}b_{31} + \lambda_2 b_{23}b_{32} &= t_3, \end{aligned}$$

where t_1, t_2, t_3 are some elements of $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$.

We consider these equalities as a system of linear equations in three unknowns $x_1 = b_{12}b_{21}$, $x_2 = b_{13}b_{31}$, $x_3 = b_{23}b_{32}$. The matrix L of this system is

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_2 & \lambda_3 & 0 \\ \lambda_1 & 0 & \lambda_3 \\ 0 & \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

A short computation shows that $\det L = -2\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3 = -2\det A \neq 0$. Solving this system by Cramer's rule, we conclude that every x_i lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. ■

Lemma 2.4 *Let Γ be a subgroup of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ containing a loxodromic element $A = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$, where $\lambda_1 = \lambda e^{i\varphi}$, $\lambda_2 = e^{-i2\varphi}$, $\lambda_3 = \lambda^{-1} e^{i\varphi}$. Then for any element $B = (b_{ij}) \in \Gamma$, the products $b_{12}\bar{b}_{32}$, $b_{13}\bar{b}_{31}$, $b_{23}\bar{b}_{21}$ are in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$.*

PROOF: Let $C = BAB^{-1}$. Let us compute the diagonal elements c_{ii} of the matrix C . They are

$$\begin{aligned} c_{11} &= \lambda_1 b_{11}\bar{b}_{33} + \lambda_2 b_{12}\bar{b}_{32} + \lambda_3 b_{13}\bar{b}_{31}, \\ c_{22} &= \lambda_1 b_{21}\bar{b}_{23} + \lambda_2 b_{22}\bar{b}_{22} + \lambda_3 b_{23}\bar{b}_{21}, \\ c_{33} &= \lambda_1 b_{31}\bar{b}_{13} + \lambda_2 b_{32}\bar{b}_{12} + \lambda_3 b_{33}\bar{b}_{11}. \end{aligned}$$

By applying Lemma 2.2, we get that c_{ii} lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. Since λ is real, we have that the field $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$ is invariant under complex conjugation. Hence, $b_{11}\bar{b}_{33}$, $b_{22}\bar{b}_{22}$, $b_{33}\bar{b}_{11}$ are all in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. Therefore, we can re-write these equalities in the following form

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_2 b_{12} \bar{b}_{32} + \lambda_3 b_{13} \bar{b}_{31} &= t_1, \\ \lambda_1 b_{21} \bar{b}_{23} + \lambda_3 b_{23} \bar{b}_{21} &= t_2, \\ \lambda_1 b_{31} \bar{b}_{13} + \lambda_2 b_{32} \bar{b}_{12} &= t_3,\end{aligned}$$

where t_1, t_2, t_3 are some elements of $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$.

Now let $D = B^{-1}AB$. Again we compute the diagonal elements d_{ii} of this matrix. They are

$$\begin{aligned}d_{11} &= \lambda_1 b_{11} \bar{b}_{33} + \lambda_2 b_{21} \bar{b}_{23} + \lambda_3 b_{31} \bar{b}_{13}, \\ d_{22} &= \lambda_1 b_{12} \bar{b}_{32} + \lambda_2 b_{22} \bar{b}_{22} + \lambda_3 b_{32} \bar{b}_{12}, \\ d_{33} &= \lambda_1 b_{13} \bar{b}_{31} + \lambda_2 b_{23} \bar{b}_{21} + \lambda_3 b_{33} \bar{b}_{11}.\end{aligned}$$

By applying the above arguments, we re-write these equalities in the following form

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_2 b_{21} \bar{b}_{23} + \lambda_3 b_{31} \bar{b}_{13} &= s_1, \\ \lambda_1 b_{12} \bar{b}_{32} + \lambda_3 b_{31} \bar{b}_{12} &= s_2, \\ \lambda_1 b_{13} \bar{b}_{32} + \lambda_2 b_{23} \bar{b}_{21} &= s_3,\end{aligned}$$

where s_1, s_2, s_3 are some elements of $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$.

We consider the first and the conjugate third equality defined by C and the conjugate first equality defined by D . So, we have the following equalities

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_2 b_{12} \bar{b}_{32} + \lambda_3 b_{13} \bar{b}_{31} &= t_1, \\ \bar{\lambda}_1 b_{13} \bar{b}_{31} + \bar{\lambda}_2 b_{12} \bar{b}_{32} &= \bar{t}_3, \\ \bar{\lambda}_2 b_{23} \bar{b}_{21} + \bar{\lambda}_3 b_{13} \bar{b}_{31} &= \bar{s}_1.\end{aligned}$$

These equalities define a system of linear equations in three unknowns $x_1 = b_{12}\bar{b}_{32}$, $x_2 = b_{13}\bar{b}_{31}$, $x_3 = b_{23}\bar{b}_{21}$. The matrix L of this system is

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_2 & \lambda_3 & 0 \\ \bar{\lambda}_2 & \bar{\lambda}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{\lambda}_3 & \bar{\lambda}_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The determinant $\det L = \lambda_2(\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{\lambda}_2) - \lambda_3 \bar{\lambda}_2^2 = e^{2i\varphi}(e^{-3i\varphi} \lambda - e^{3i\varphi} \lambda^{-1})$. It is seen that $\det L = 0$ if and only if $\lambda^2 = e^{6i\varphi}$. This is impossible since $\lambda > 0, \lambda \neq 1$. Solving this system by Cramer's rule, we conclude that every x_i lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. ■

The following proposition is crucial in the proof of our main result.

Proposition 2.1 *Let $\Gamma = \langle A, B \rangle$ be an irreducible subgroup of $SU(2, 1)$, where A is a loxodromic element with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 = \lambda e^{i\varphi}$, $\lambda_2 = e^{-2i\varphi}$, $\lambda_3 = \lambda^{-1}e^{i\varphi}$. Then Γ is conjugate in $SU(2, 1)$ to a subgroup of $SU(2, 1, \mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda))$.*

PROOF: We will show that one needs at most two conjugations to get the result we need.

First, by applying a suitable conjugation in $SU(2, 1)$, we may assume that

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} & b_{13} \\ b_{21} & b_{22} & b_{23} \\ b_{31} & b_{32} & b_{33} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We denote by $v_1 = (b_{11}, b_{12}, b_{13})^T$, $v_2 = (b_{21}, b_{22}, b_{23})^T$, $v_3 = (b_{31}, b_{32}, b_{33})^T$ the vectors defined by the rows of the matrix B .

Let $X \in SU(2, 1)$ be a loxodromic element (elliptic if $r=1$) such that

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} re^{i\alpha} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2i\alpha} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & r^{-1}e^{i\alpha} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $XAX^{-1} = A$ and XBX^{-1} is

$$XBX^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & re^{3i\alpha}b_{12} & r^2b_{13} \\ r^{-1}e^{-3i\alpha}b_{21} & b_{22} & re^{-3i\alpha}b_{23} \\ r^{-2}b_{31} & r^{-1}e^{3i\alpha}b_{32} & b_{33} \end{bmatrix}.$$

If the entries b_{12} , b_{32} of B are all equal to 0, then the group Γ is not irreducible since in this case A and B have a common invariant complex line spanned by the vector $(0, 1, 0)^T$. In this case, Γ is a $\mathbb{C}$ -group. Therefore, at least one of the numbers b_{12}, b_{32} is not equal to 0. Let us suppose that $b_{12} \neq 0$. In this case, by normalizing the elements A and B using X , we may assume without loss of generality that $b_{12} = 1$.

From the above results we know that b_{ii} , $b_{12}b_{21}$, $b_{13}b_{31}$, $b_{23}b_{32}$, $b_{12}\bar{b}_{32}$, $b_{13}\bar{b}_{31}$, $b_{23}\bar{b}_{21}$ are all in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$.

Since $b_{12} = 1$, we get that b_{21} and b_{32} are in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. Let us first consider the case $b_{21} = 0$. Then we have that $b_{31} \neq 0$. Indeed, if $b_{31} = 0$, then A and B have a common invariant complex line spanned by the vector $(1, 0, 0)^T$. This is impossible because Γ is irreducible. Let us assume now that $b_{32} = 0$. Since the vectors v_2 and v_3 are orthogonal, we get that $\langle v_2, v_3 \rangle = b_{23}\bar{b}_{31} = 0$. So, in this case, $b_{23} = 0$. This implies that $b_{22} \neq 0$. Hence, $\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle = \bar{b}_{22} \neq 0$, a contradiction. Therefore, we have that $b_{32} \neq 0$. It follows that b_{23} lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. Since the vectors v_1 and v_2 are orthogonal, we have that $b_{23} \neq 0$. Then, by considering the equality $\langle v_2, v_3 \rangle = b_{22}\bar{b}_{32} + b_{23}\bar{b}_{31} = 0$, we conclude that b_{31} lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. Since $b_{31} \neq 0$, we get that b_{13} lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. This shows that all the entries of the matrix B are in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. Therefore, we proved the proposition in this case.

Now let us assume that $b_{21} \neq 0$. It follows immediately that b_{23} lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$.

We write $\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle = b_{11}\bar{b}_{23} + \bar{b}_{22} + b_{13}\bar{b}_{21} = 0$. Since $b_{21} \neq 0$, this implies that b_{13} is in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. If $b_{13} \neq 0$, we get that b_{31} is in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. Suppose that $b_{13} = 0$. In this case, $b_{23} \neq 0$, since otherwise A and B have a common invariant complex line spanned by the vector $(0, 0, 1)^T$. This is impossible because Γ is irreducible.

We write $\langle v_2, v_3 \rangle = b_{21}\bar{b}_{33} + b_{22}\bar{b}_{32} + b_{23}\bar{b}_{31} = 0$. Since $b_{23} \neq 0$, we get that b_{31} lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$.

Summarizing everything, we get that in the case $b_{12} \neq 0$ after conjugation all the entries of the matrix B lie in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. The case $b_{12} = 0$, $b_{32} \neq 0$ is similar to the previous one. $\blacksquare$

Next we prove that any irreducible subgroup of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ contains a loxodromic element. First, we will prove the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5 *Let Γ be a non-elementary subgroup of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$. If Γ contains a parabolic element, then Γ contains a loxodromic element.*

PROOF: Let $B \in \Gamma$ be parabolic. Then B has a unique invariant isotropic complex line in V . By normalizing Γ in $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$, we may assume without loss of generality that this line is spanned by the vector $(1, 0, 0)^T$. This implies that B has the following form:

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} & b_{13} \\ 0 & b_{22} & b_{23} \\ 0 & b_{32} & b_{33} \end{bmatrix}.$$

As before, we denote by $v_1 = (b_{11}, b_{12}, b_{13})^T$, $v_2 = (b_{21}, b_{22}, b_{23})^T$, $v_3 = (b_{31}, b_{32}, b_{33})^T$ the vectors defined by the rows of the matrix B .

We consider two cases: (1) $b_{12} = 0$, (2) $b_{12} \neq 0$.

First, we consider the case $b_{12} = 0$. We have that $\langle v_2, v_2 \rangle = |b_{22}|^2 = 1$. From this and the equality $\langle v_2, v_3 \rangle = 0$, we get that $b_{32} = 0$. Then the equality $\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle = b_{11}\bar{b}_{23} = 0$ implies that $b_{23} = 0$. From the equality $\langle v_1, v_3 \rangle = 1$, we get that $b_{11}\bar{b}_{33} = 1$. Since B is parabolic, we have that $b_{13} \neq 0$ and that $|b_{11}| = 1$. Hence $|b_{33}| = 1$. We write $b_{11} = e^{i\varphi}$ and $b_{13} = re^{i\theta}$, $r > 0$. Then the equality $\langle v_1, v_1 \rangle = 0$ implies that $b_{13} = rie^{i\varphi}$. Therefore, when $b_{12} = 0$, the element B after a suitable normalization of Γ has the following form:

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\varphi} & 0 & rie^{i\varphi} \\ 0 & e^{-2i\varphi} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\varphi} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We remark that if $\varphi = 0$, then B is unipotent and B is ellipto-parabolic otherwise.

Next, we consider the case $b_{12} \neq 0$. Using the same arguments as in the first case, we get that $|b_{22}| = 1$ and $b_{32} = 0$. Since $b_{12} \neq 0$, by normalizing Γ using the element X defined in the proof of Proposition 2.1, we may assume without loss of generality that $b_{12} = 1$. The equality $\langle v_1, v_3 \rangle = 1$ implies that $b_{11}\bar{b}_{33} = 1$.

Note that in this case B is always unipotent. Hence $b_{11} = 1$. This implies that $b_{22} = b_{33} = 1$. Then it follows from the equality $\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle = 0$ that $b_{23} = -1$. Now let us consider the equality $\langle v_1, v_1 \rangle = \bar{b}_{13} + b_{13} + 1 = 0$. It is easy to see that this equality is true if and only if $b_{13} = -1/2 + si$, where s is real. Summarizing everything, we get that in the case $b_{12} \neq 0$ after a suitable normalization of Γ the element B has the following form:

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \tau \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\tau = -1/2 + si$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Easy induction shows that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ in the first case

$$B^n = \begin{bmatrix} e^{ni\varphi} & 0 & e^{ni\varphi} inr \\ 0 & e^{-2ni\varphi} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{ni\varphi} \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$B^n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & n & n\tau + f(n) \\ 0 & 1 & -n \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

in the second case, where the function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is defined by the following conditions: $f(1) = 0$ and $f(n+1) = f(n) - n$. It is easy to show that $f(n) = (1-n)n/2$.

Since Γ is non-elementary it contains an element C which does not leave invariant the complex line spanned by the vector $(1, 0, 0)^T$. Let $C = (c_{ij})$. Then we have that $c_{31} \neq 0$. Easy computation shows that

$$\text{tr}(B^n C) = c_{11}e^{ni\varphi} + c_{31}e^{ni\varphi} inr + c_{22}e^{-2ni\varphi} + c_{33}e^{ni\varphi}$$

in the first case, and

$$\text{tr}(B^n C) = c_{11} + c_{21}n + c_{31}(n\tau + f(n)) + c_{22} - c_{32}n + c_{33}$$

in the second one.

Hence, in the first case

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{tr}(B^n C)| &= |c_{31}e^{ni\varphi} inr - (-c_{11}e^{ni\varphi} - c_{22}e^{-2ni\varphi} - c_{33}e^{ni\varphi})| \\ &\geq |c_{31}e^{ni\varphi} inr| - |(-c_{11}e^{ni\varphi} - c_{22}e^{-2ni\varphi} - c_{33}e^{ni\varphi})| \\ &= |c_{31}|nr - |(-c_{11}e^{ni\varphi} - c_{22}e^{-2ni\varphi} - c_{33}e^{ni\varphi})|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $c_{31} \neq 0$, and $r > 0$, this inequality implies that $|\text{tr}(B^n C)|$ tends to infinity when n tends to infinity.

In the second case, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{tr}(B^n C)| &= |c_{11} + c_{21}n + c_{31}(n\tau + f(n)) + c_{22} - c_{32}n + c_{33}| \\ &\geq |c_{31}f(n)| - |-c_{31}n\tau - c_{11} - c_{21}n - c_{22} + c_{32}n - c_{33}| \\ &= |c_{31}||f(n)| - |-c_{31}n\tau - c_{11} - c_{21}n - c_{22} + c_{32}n - c_{33}|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $c_{31} \neq 0$ and $f(n)$ is quadratic, this inequality implies that $|\text{tr}(B^n C)|$ tends to infinity when n tends to infinity.

Thus, in both cases, we have that there exists n_0 such that $|\text{tr}(B^n C)| > 3$ for all $n > n_0$. Then using Goldman's classification of the elements in $\text{SU}(2, 1)$ [16], we get that the elements $B^n C$ are loxodromic for all $n > n_0$. This proves the lemma. $\blacksquare$

We are very grateful to John Parker for his help in the proof of this lemma.

In what follows, we will need the following fundamental result due to Chen and Greenberg [4]:

Proposition 2.2 *Let Γ be a subgroup of $\text{SU}(2, 1)$. Consider the natural action of Γ on $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \cup \partial\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$. If there is no point in $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \cup \partial\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ or proper totally geodesic submanifold in $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ which is invariant under Γ , then Γ is either discrete or dense in $\text{SU}(2, 1)$.*

By applying this result and Lemma 2.5, we prove the following proposition.

Proposition 2.3 *Let Γ be an irreducible subgroup of $\text{SU}(2, 1)$. Then Γ contains a loxodromic element.*

PROOF: Let us consider the natural action of Γ on the projective space $\mathbb{P}(V)$ (or equally the action of its projectivization). We know that the only proper totally geodesic submanifolds of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ are either geodesics, or complex geodesics, or totally real geodesic 2-planes [4, 16]. Note that if there is a geodesic in $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ which is invariant under Γ , then there is a complex geodesic c in $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ which is also invariant under Γ (this complex geodesic c is spanned by the geodesic in question). Therefore, the polar point to c is invariant under Γ for its action on the projective space $\mathbb{P}(V)$. Hence, if Γ is irreducible, then either Γ has no invariant proper totally geodesic submanifolds or Γ is an $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroup of $\text{SU}(2, 1)$.

First, we consider the case when Γ has no invariant totally real geodesic 2-planes. By applying Proposition 2.2, we get that Γ is either discrete or dense in $\text{SU}(2, 1)$. If Γ is dense in $\text{SU}(2, 1)$, it contains a loxodromic element since the set of loxodromic elements is open in $\text{SU}(2, 1)$ [16], and we are done. Now let us assume that Γ is a discrete subgroup of $\text{SU}(2, 1)$. Suppose that Γ has no loxodromic

elements. If Γ contains only elliptic elements, then it is easy to see that Γ is finite, and then, using the arguments similar to those in [25], we conclude that there is a point in $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ which is invariant under Γ , a contradiction. Therefore, Γ contains a parabolic element γ . Since Γ is irreducible, it contains an element not fixing the unique fixed point of γ . By applying Lemma 2.5, we get that Γ contains a loxodromic element, a contradiction.

Now, let Γ be an $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroup. Then Γ is conjugate in $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ to a subgroup of $\mathrm{SO}(2, 1)$. Since Γ is irreducible, the result follows from the plane real hyperbolic geometry [2, 25]. $\blacksquare$

Corollary 2.2 *Let G be an irreducible subgroup of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$. Then G is non-elementary.*

PROOF: Assume that G is elementary. Let $p \in \mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \cup \partial\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ be a point such that the orbit $G(p)$ of p is finite. If $p \in \mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$, then it follows from the proof of Proposition 2.3 that there is a point in $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$ which is invariant under Γ , a contradiction. Next, let us suppose that $p \in \partial\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$. By applying Proposition 2.3, we have that G contains a loxodromic element. Since $G(p)$ is finite, this implies that $G(p)$ consists of two distinct points. Let $G(p) = \{p_1, p_2\}$ and c be the unique complex geodesic spanned by $\{p_1, p_2\}$. Then c is invariant under G , and, therefore, G leaves invariant its polar point, a contradiction. $\blacksquare$

Thus, we proved that any irreducible subgroup of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ contains a loxodromic element. With this, we now prove our main result: if Γ is an irreducible subgroup of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$, then Γ is conjugate in $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ to a subgroup of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1, \mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda))$, where λ is the absolute value of an eigenvalue of any loxodromic element of Γ with $|\lambda| \neq 1$. In particular, this implies that Γ can be defined over the field $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$.

Theorem 2.1 *Let Γ be an irreducible subgroup of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$. Let $A \in \Gamma$ be any loxodromic element with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 = \lambda e^{i\varphi}$, $\lambda_2 = e^{-2i\varphi}$, $\lambda_3 = \lambda^{-1} e^{i\varphi}$. Then Γ is conjugate in $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ to a subgroup of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1, \mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda))$.*

PROOF: First, we show that Γ contains two loxodromic elements A_1 and A_2 having the same eigenvalues as A (in fact, we show that A_1 and A_2 are conjugate to A in Γ) such that the subgroup $\Gamma_0 = \langle A_1, A_2 \rangle$ generated by A_1 and A_2 is irreducible. In what follows, we consider the natural action of Γ on the projective space $\mathbb{P}(V)$. We remark that A has three fixed points p_1, p_2, p_3 for its action on the projective space: p_1, p_2 are isotropic and p_3 is positive, p_3 is the polar point to the complex projective line α spanned by p_1 and p_2 . If all the elements of Γ fix the point p_3 , then Γ is reducible. So, there exists an element B of Γ which does not fix p_3 . Let $C = BAB^{-1}$ and $q_3 = B(p_3)$. Then $C(q_3) = q_3$. Note that C is loxodromic, hence C does not fix p_3 . Let q_1 and q_2 be the isotropic fixed point of C . If the sets $\{p_1, p_2\}$ and $\{q_1, q_2\}$ are disjoint, taking $A_1 = A$ and $A_2 = C$ we are done, since in this case the elements A and C have no common fixed points for their action on $\mathbb{P}(V)$. So, let us consider the case when these sets have non-empty intersection, that is, when the elements A and C have a common isotropic fixed point. If

$\{p_1, p_2\} = \{q_1, q_2\}$, then the complex projective line α is invariant under C , and, therefore, $C(p_3) = p_3$, a contradiction. This implies that A and C may have only one common isotropic fixed point. One may assume without loss of generality that $p_1 = q_1$ is a unique common isotropic fixed point of A and C . Then since Γ is irreducible, there exists an element $D \in \Gamma$ which does not fix the point p_1 . Let $E = DAD^{-1}$. We have that E is loxodromic and $E(p_1) \neq p_1$. If the invariant complex geodesic β of E is not equal to α , then taking $A_1 = A$ and $A_2 = E$, we are done. If $\alpha = \beta$, we take $A_1 = C$ and $A_2 = E$.

Now, by applying Proposition 2.1, we get that there exists $f \in \text{SU}(2, 1)$ such that $\Gamma_0^* = f\Gamma_0 f^{-1}$ is a subgroup of $\text{SU}(2, 1, \mathbb{Q}(\Gamma_0, \lambda))$. Let $\Gamma^* = f\Gamma f^{-1}$. Then Γ_0^* is a subgroup of Γ^* . In order to show that Γ^* is a subgroup of $\text{SU}(2, 1, \mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda))$, we apply Burnside's density theorem, stated as Theorem 16" in I.Kaplansky [20], and the trick which one can find in the proof of Theorem B in I.Kaplansky [20]. According to I.Kaplansky this trick is due to C.Procesi.

Since Γ_0^* is irreducible, by applying Burnside's density theorem, we get that Γ_0^* contains a basis of $M(3, \mathbb{C})$ over $\mathbb{C}$. Let $S = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_9\}$ be such a basis. Then it follows that for any element $\gamma \in \Gamma^*$ there exist complex numbers $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_9$ such that

$$\gamma = c_1 S_1 + c_2 S_2 + \dots + c_9 S_9.$$

Let $\text{Tr}(A, B) = (A, B)$ denote the trace form on $M(3, \mathbb{C})$ so that

$$(A, B) = \text{Tr}(A, B) = \text{tr}(AB).$$

It is well-known that Tr is a non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form.

It follows from the equality

$$\gamma = c_1 S_1 + c_2 S_2 + \dots + c_9 S_9$$

that

$$(\gamma, S_i) = c_1(S_1, S_i) + c_2(S_2, S_i) + \dots + c_9(S_9, S_i)$$

for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, 9$.

We consider these equalities as a system of linear equations in unknowns $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_9$. We have that for all $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, 9$, the product (S_i, S_j) is in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma_0, \lambda)$, and the product (γ, S_i) is in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. Therefore, this implies that every coefficient of the system lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. Since the form Tr is non-degenerate, this system is non-singular. Solving this system by Cramer's rule, we conclude that every c_i lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$. This implies that every $\gamma \in \Gamma^*$ lies in $\text{SU}(2, 1, \mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda))$. From this, we conclude that Γ^* is a subgroup of $\text{SU}(2, 1, \mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda))$. $\blacksquare$

As a corollary of this theorem, we get the following.

Theorem 2.2 *Let Γ be an irreducible subgroup of $\text{SU}(2, 1)$ such that $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma)$ is a subset of $\mathbb{R}$, then Γ is conjugate in $\text{SU}(2, 1)$ to a subgroup of $\text{SO}(2, 1)$.*

PROOF: Since Γ is irreducible, it follows from Proposition 2.3 that Γ contains a loxodromic element A . Let $\lambda_1 = \lambda e^{i\varphi}$, $\lambda_2 = e^{-2i\varphi}$, $\lambda_3 = \lambda^{-1} e^{i\varphi}$ be its eigenvalues. It is easy to see that in this case all the eigenvalues of A are real: A is either hyperbolic or loxodromic whose elliptic part is of order 2. Since the field $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma)$ is real, the field $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma, \lambda)$ is also real. So, the result follows from Theorem 2.1. $\blacksquare$

We would like to stress that in Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 we do not assume that the group Γ is discrete.

Next we show that the conclusions of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 are not true if Γ is reducible. Indeed, let us consider the embedding of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ in $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 & -ib \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ ic & 0 & d \end{bmatrix}.$$

This defines a faithful representation of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ in $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$. Let Γ be the image of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ under this embedding. Then Γ is reducible because the complex line spanned by the vector $(0, 1, 0)^T$ is invariant under Γ . In fact, Γ is a $\mathbb{C}$ -subgroup of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$. Also, we have that the trace field of Γ is real. It is easy to see that Γ cannot be conjugate in $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ to a subgroup of $\mathrm{SO}(2, 1)$. Moreover, if we consider the image of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ under this embedding, we get an example of a non-elementary discrete subgroup of $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ whose trace field is $\mathbb{Q}$ but which is not conjugate in $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ to a subgroup of $\mathrm{SO}(2, 1)$.

Now we consider the case of subgroups of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$. We would like to find conditions under which a subgroup G of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ leaves invariant a totally real geodesic 2-plane in $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$. It is natural to ask if it is possible or not to get an answer in terms of the traces of lifts of elements of G to $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$.

Let $\pi : \mathrm{SU}(2, 1) \rightarrow \mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ be a natural projection. Let G be a subgroup of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$. Then the *trace field* of G , denoted $\mathbb{Q}(G)$, is the field $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma)$, where $\Gamma = \pi^{-1}(G)$. We remark that this field is never real.

The following example is useful to understand the problem. Let Γ be a subgroup of $\mathrm{SO}(2, 1)$ such that the restriction $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ is a monomorphism. Let $G = \pi(\Gamma)$. We have that Γ is a lift of G . One could define an "invariant" trace field of G as the trace field of Γ . And, in this case, this field is real! So, it would be natural to define an "invariant" trace field of a subgroup G of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ which has a lift to $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ as the trace field of its lift. Unfortunately, the problem when a subgroup G of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ has a lift to $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ is still open, and it seems very difficult. To our knowledge, the only results in this direction are in [17], in the case when G is isomorphic to the fundamental group of a closed orientable surface. Some examples when G has no lift, the reader can find in [1]. The lifting problem in the case of real hyperbolic geometry of dimension three was completely solved in [5].

In [26], [21], [28] the invariant trace field was defined for subgroups of $\mathrm{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$, see also [23], for the case of $\mathrm{SU}(n, 1)$. We follow their ideas to define an invariant

trace field for subgroups of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$.

Let G be a subgroup of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ and $\Gamma = \pi^{-1}(G)$. Then the *invariant trace field* of G , denoted by $k(G)$, is defined to be the field $\mathbb{Q}(\Gamma^3)$, where $\Gamma^3 = \langle \gamma^3 : \gamma \in \Gamma \rangle$. It follows from [23] that the invariant trace field is an invariant of the commensurability class.

If $A \in \mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$, then we have the following trace identity

$$\mathrm{tr}(A^3) = (\mathrm{tr}(A))^3 - 3\mathrm{tr}(A)\mathrm{tr}(A^{-1}) + 3,$$

see, for instance, [24]. Since an element of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ has three lifts to $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ which differ by a cube root of unity, it follows from this formula that if G is an $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroup of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$, then the invariant trace field of G is real.

By applying Theorem 2.2, we get the following characterization of discrete $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroups of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$.

Theorem 2.3 *Let G be an irreducible discrete subgroup of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$. Then G is an $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroup if and only if the invariant trace field $k(G)$ of G is real.*

PROOF: Let $\Gamma = \pi^{-1}(G)$. Then it is clear that Γ and Γ^3 are irreducible. Let $H = \pi(\Gamma^3)$. It follows from Theorem 2.2 that Γ^3 is conjugate in $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ to a subgroup of $\mathrm{SO}(2, 1)$. This implies that H leaves invariant a totally real geodesic 2-plane L in $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$. Since Γ^3 is a normal subgroup of Γ , it follows that H is a normal subgroup of G . Since the group G is irreducible, it follows from Corollary 2.2 that G is non-elementary. Therefore, the normality implies that the limit set of H is equal to the limit set of G , see, for instance, [4]. We remark that the limit set of H is contained in the boundary of L . Moreover, using the fact that G is non-elementary, we have that the set of fixed points of loxodromic elements of G is dense in its limit set. This implies that L is invariant with respect to G . Therefore, G is an $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroup of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$. ■

As an immediate corollary we get the following theorem.

Theorem 2.4 *Let G be a discrete non-elementary subgroup of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ such that the invariant trace field $k(G)$ of G is real. Then G is either $\mathbb{R}$ -Fuchsian or $\mathbb{C}$ -Fuchsian.*

PROOF: If G is irreducible, then it follows from Theorem 2.3 that G is $\mathbb{R}$ -Fuchsian. Now let us assume that G is reducible. Let p be a common fixed point of all elements of G in their action on the projective space $\mathbb{P}(V)$. Since G is non-elementary, we have that p cannot be in $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2 \cup \partial\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^2$. So, p is positive. This implies that G leaves invariant the complex geodesic whose polar point is p . Therefore, the group G is $\mathbb{C}$ -Fuchsian. ■

We remark that Theorem 2.4 can be considered as a complex hyperbolic analog of a classical result due to B.Maskit, see Theorem G.18 in [22] and Corollary 3.2.5 in [21].

We say that $g \in \mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ is a screw motion iff any lift of g to $\mathrm{SU}(2, 1)$ has non-real trace. For instance, purely hyperbolic and unipotent parabolic elements are not screw motions. Geometrically, $g \in \mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ is not screw motion iff g has an invariant totally real geodesic 2-plane.

Corollary 2.3 *Let G be an irreducible discrete subgroup of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$. Then G is an $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroup if and only if G contains no screw motions.*

Corollary 2.4 *Let G be an irreducible discrete subgroup of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ whose limit set is not contained in an $\mathbb{R}$ -circle. Then its invariant trace field is non-real extension of $\mathbb{Q}$.*

Corollary 2.5 *Let G be a discrete subgroup of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ of finite co-volume. Then its invariant trace field is non-real extension of $\mathbb{Q}$.*

PROOF: It is clear that G is irreducible. Suppose that the invariant trace field $k(G)$ of G is real. By Theorem 2.3, G is an $\mathbb{R}$ -subgroup of $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$. Therefore, the limit set of G is contained in an $\mathbb{R}$ -circle. This implies that G cannot have finite co-volume. ■

Acknowledgements. We are very grateful to John Parker for helpful conversations. We are also thankful to the referee for useful remarks and suggestions.

References

- [1] S. Anan'in, C. Grossi, N. Gusevskii, Complex hyperbolic structures on disc bundles over surfaces. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 2011 (2011), no. 19, 4295-4375.
- [2] A. Beardon, The geometry of discrete groups. *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, 91. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983. xii+337 pp.
- [3] J. Bernik, On groups and semigroups of matrices with spectra in a finitely generated field. *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 53 (2005), no. 4, 259-267.
- [4] S.S Chen, L. Greenberg, Hyperbolic spaces. *Contributions to analysis* (a collection of papers dedicated to Lipman Bers), pp. 49-87. Academic Press, New York, 1974.
- [5] M. Culler, Lifting representations to covering groups. *Adv. in Math.* 59 (1986), no. 1, 64-70.
- [6] H. Cunha, N. Gusevskii, On the moduli space of quadruples of points in the boundary of complex hyperbolic space. *Transform. Groups* 15 (2010), no. 2, 261-283.
- [7] H. Cunha, N. Gusevskii, The moduli space of points in the boundary of complex hyperbolic space. *J. Geom. Anal.* 22 (2012), no. 1, 1-11.

- [8] H. Cunha, F. Dutenhefner, N. Gusevskii, R. Thebadi, The moduli space of complex geodesics in the complex hyperbolic plane. *J. Geom. Anal.* 22 (2012), no. 2, 295-319.
- [9] F. Dutenhefner, N. Gusevskii, Complex hyperbolic Kleinian groups with limit set a wild knot. *Topology* 43 (2004), 677-696.
- [10] D. Epstein, Complex hyperbolic geometry. Analytical and geometric aspects of hyperbolic space (Coventry/Durham, 1984), 93-111, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 111, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1987.
- [11] E. Falbel, F. Gabor, P.D. Lax, J.R. Parker, Generators of a Picard modular group in two complex dimensions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 139 (2011), no. 7, 2439-2447.
- [12] E. Falbel, F. Gabor, J.R. Parker, The geometry of the Gauss-Picard modular group. *Math. Ann.* 349 (2011), no. 2, 459-508.
- [13] E. Falbel, J.R. Parker, The geometry of the Eisenstein-Picard modular group. *Duke Math. J.* 131 (2006), no. 2, 249-289.
- [14] Fu, Xi; Li, Liulan; Wang, Xiantao; A characterization of Fuchsian groups acting on complex hyperbolic spaces. *Czechoslovak Math. J.* 62 (137) (2012), no. 2, 517-525.
- [15] J. Genzmer, Trace fields of subgroups of $SU(n, 1)$. preprint (arXiv:1106.5986v1), 2011.
- [16] W.M. Goldman, Complex hyperbolic geometry. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford Science Publications. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999. xx+316 pp.
- [17] W.M. Goldman, M. Kapovich, B. Leeb, Complex hyperbolic manifolds homotopy equivalent to a Riemann surface. *Comm. Anal. Geom.* 9 (2001), no. 1, 61-95.
- [18] N. Gusevskii, J.R. Parker, Representations of free Fuchsian groups in complex hyperbolic space. *Topology* 39 (2000), no. 1, 33-60.
- [19] N. Gusevskii, J.R. Parker, Complex hyperbolic quasi-Fuchsian groups and Toledo's invariant. Special volume dedicated to the memory of Hanna Miriam Sandler (1960-1999). *Geom. Dedicata* 97 (2003), 151-185.
- [20] I. Kaplansky, Fields and rings. Second edition. Chicago Lectures in Mathematics. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.-London, 1972. x+206 pp.
- [21] C. Maclachlan, A.W. Reid, The arithmetic of hyperbolic 3-manifolds. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 219. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003. xiv+463 pp.

- [22] B. Maskit, Kleinian groups. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], 287. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988. xiv+326 pp.
- [23] D.B. McReynolds, Arithmetic lattices in $SU(n, 1)$. in preparation.
- [24] J.R. Parker, Traces in complex hyperbolic geometry. Geometry, Topology and Dynamics of Character Varieties, Lecture Notes Series 23, Institute for Mathematical Sciences, National University of Singapore, 2012, 191-245.
- [25] J.G. Ratcliffe, Foundations of hyperbolic manifolds. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 149. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994. xii+747 pp.
- [26] A.W. Reid, A note on trace-fields of Kleinian groups. Bull. London Math. Soc. 22 (1990), no. 4, 349-352.
- [27] E.B. Vinberg, Rings of definition of dense subgroups of semisimple linear groups. (Russian) Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. 35 (1971), 45-55.
- [28] E.B. Vinberg, The smallest field of definition of a subgroup of the group PSL_2 . (Russian) Mat. Sb. 184 (1993), no. 10, 53-66; translation in Russian Acad. Sci. Sb. Math. 80 (1995), no. 1, 179-190.
- [29] P. Will, Traces, cross-ratios and 2-generator subgroups of $SU(2,1)$. Canad. J. Math. 61 (2009), no. 6, 1407-1436.
- [30] B. Xie, The complex hyperbolic Kleinian groups with an invariant totally geodesic submanifold. preprint (arXiv:1006.5581v2), 2011.